UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,317	01/22/2004	Moon-young Woo	Q76053	3094

23373   7590   03/31/2009
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER
PARK, JEONG S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2454	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/31/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/761,317	WOO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JEONG S. PARK	2454	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/31/2008*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 10-16, 19 and 21-30* is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 10-16, 19 and 21-30* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 12/31/2008, with respect to claim 1-7, 10-16, 19 and

21-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In response to applicant's argument on interpretations of test case and session,

Dutta teaches as follows:

Applicant's test cases are interpreted as the WML/HTML applications/files (test

the WML/HTML applications on a multitude of user agents/browsers, see, e.g., col. 4,

lines 18-25); and

Applicant's session is interpreted as a web page (execute a web page on all of

the selected browsers and displays the web page, see, e.g., col. 4, lines 43-47).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1-7, 10-16, 19 and 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Dutta et al. (hereinafter Dutta)(U.S. Patent No. 6,918,066 B2) in view

of Manda (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0103394 A1).

Regarding claims 1-3, Dutta teaches as follows:

a browser testing system comprises a browser test server (interpreted as a Web

server testing software, 43 in figure 3, housed with as a stand-alone tool, hereinafter

interpreted as a web test server) connected via one or more wired or wireless

communication networks (Internet 42 in figure 3) to a device or a browser testing device

(client machine 40 in figure 3) equipped with a browser operable to access the Internet

(see, e.g., col. 7, lines 1-22);

wherein one or more test cases (WML/HTML applications/files) to test the

browser (test the WML/HTML applications on a multitude of user agents/browsers, see,

e.g., col. 4, lines 18-25);

wherein the browser test server (web test server, 43 in figure 3) provides a tester

with a session (execute a web page on all of the selected browsers and displays the

web page, see, e.g., col. 4, lines 43-47) generated from one or more predetermined test

cases (WML/HTML applications/files) accessing the browser test server through the

communication networks (establish the rules to generate a scorecard for evaluating the

web site for effectiveness on the different web browsers, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 32-37);

wherein the browser test server stores one or more values (scorecard) obtained

from the browser testing by use of the session (display the output of the HTML/WML file

as well as the evaluation scorecard for the selected browsers in the virtual screen, see,

e.g., col. 8, lines 46-50 and step 66 in figure 7);

wherein each of the test cases is a contents file (WML/HTML file is equivalent to

the applicant's content file) including one or more tags (HTML source code tag, see,

e.g., col. 4, lines 18-34) or one or more script symbols corresponding to predetermined

contents that will be tested as to whether the contents are normally provided through

the browser (see, e.g., col. 4, lines 23-34); and

the session includes the one or more predetermined test case selected by the

tester which constitute a single web page and the session is the web page for the

browser testing, the web page having a predetermined URL address that indicates a

location where the web page is registered on the browser test server (URL pointing to a

file that contains the location of the web site that the designer wants to evaluate, see,

e.g., col. 8, lines 25-30 and step 60 in figure 7).

Dutta does not teach that one or more test cases to test the browser are

registered on the browser test server.

Manda teaches as follows:

a plurality of test cases (test case applet A,B and C) registered on the browser

test server (trigger identifies the proper template file from the set of template files that

are specified in the configuration file, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0040], wherein each

template file may be JavaScript-controlled HTML list box, such as applets A, B, C, for

test suite, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0042]);

a mechanism for testing execution of applets with plug-ins and applications

includes test cases and each test case is executed by a Java Plug-in that executes with

a web browser (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]);

scheduler (130 in figure 1) loads an HTML page that lists the test cases for a test

suite in a JavaScript controlled HTML list box for the test suite (see, e.g., page 2,

paragraph [0032] and page 3, paragraph [0042]); and

one or more test cases are identified based on a template file, such as an HTML

file that lists the applets for a particular test suite (see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0085]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the
invention to combine Manda with Dutta in order to efficiently select one or more test
cases based on a template file lists the test cases for a particular test suite.

Regarding claim 4, Dutta teaches as follows:

the browser test server (interpreted as a Web server testing software, 43 in figure
3, housed with as a stand-alone tool) comprises:

a second platform for testing the browser, registering a session including a
predetermined test case as selected by the tester with the database (storage device 25
in figure 2, see, e.g., col. 6, lines 26-40)(web designer selects the URL for the web page
and stores at the server location, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 26-29), collecting the values
(scorecard) obtained through the browser testing by use of the session and recording
the values in the session (web site is evaluated for effectiveness on the different web
browsers using the scorecard rules generated, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 32-44); and

a third platform for reporting a result from the browser testing through the session
recorded with the values (display the output of the HTML/WML file as well as the
evaluation scorecard for the selected browsers in the virtual screen, see, e.g., col. 8,
lines 46-50 and step 66 in figure 7).

Dutta does not teach of developing a test case, into which a test case for testing
the browser is entered and registered with a database.

Manda also teaches as follows:

specifying particular test cases are executed for testing multiple browser types
and versions (see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0068]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Manda with Dutta in order to efficiently select one or more test

cases based on specific browser types or versions.

Regarding claim 5, Dutta teaches as follows:

the database (storage device) includes one or more test cases (WML/HTML file

or a URL pointing to a file that contains the location of the Web site, see, e.g., col. 8,

lines 25-29) and one or more sessions stored by categories classified according to

browser characteristics (an emulator program includes a database of tags, which is

supported by each browser in the browser set, see, e.g., col. 4, lines 18-33), and each

of the sessions includes the values obtained from the browser testing (scorecard gives

the user a summary of how the web site would be displayed on the various browsers,

see, e.g., col. 7, lines 50-59 and step 62 in figure 7).

Regarding claim 6, Dutta does not teach of reporting the result of the test cases.

Manda teaches as follows:

reporting the result of the browser testing includes representing the values for the

test cases as at least one of tables and graphs and outputting the represented values

as a document (trace files, 142A-C in figure 1, store the results of executing the test

cases, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033]).

Therefore, it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claims 1-3.

Regarding claim 7, Dutta teaches as follows:

wherein reporting the result of the browser testing includes creating a new

session by extracting, deleting or adding only those test cases having a particular value

(interpreted as a tag which is supported by each browser in the browser set, see, e.g.,

col. 4, lines 28-32) from or to the test cases and retesting the browser by using the

newly created session (designer can edit the web pages and test again based on the

appearance in the displays and the browser scorecard, see, e.g., col.8, lines 51-64 and

steps 65-68).

Manda teaches that trace files store the results of executing the test cases (see,

e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033]).

Therefore, it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 6.

Regarding claim 10, Dutta teaches as follows:

a browser testing method, comprising:

a session creating step of creating a session (open web pages to be tested with

multitude of browsers) including one or more predetermined test cases as selected by a

tester that gains access to a browser test server in which one or more test cases for use

in testing a browser installed on a device connectable to the Internet (see, e.g., step 60

and 61 in figure 7 and col. 8, lines 25-32);

a browser testing step of testing the browser by using the created session and of

inputting result values of the browser test (see, e.g., steps 62-66 in figure 7 and col. 8,

lines 32-50);

wherein each of the test cases is a contents file (WML/HTML file is equivalent to

the applicant's content file) including one or more tags (HTML source code tag, see,

e.g., col. 4, lines 18-34) or one or more script symbols corresponding to predetermined

contents that will be tested as to whether the contents are normally provided through

the browser (see, e.g., col. 4, lines 23-34); and

the session includes the one or more predetermined test case selected by the tester which constitute a single web page and the session is the web page for the browser testing, the web page having a predetermined URL address that indicates a location where the web page is registered on the browser test server (URL pointing to a file that contains the location of the web site that the designer wants to evaluate, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 25-30 and step 60 in figure 7).

Dutta does not teach that one or more test cases to test the browser are registered.

Manda teaches as follows:

a plurality of test cases (test case applet A,B and C) registered on the browser test server (trigger identifies the proper template file from the set of template files that are specified in the configuration file, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0040], wherein each template file may be JavaScript-controlled HTML list box, such as applets A, B, C, for test suite, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0042]);

a mechanism for testing execution of applets with plug-ins and applications includes test cases and each test case is executed by a Java Plug-in that executes with a web browser (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]);

scheduler (130 in figure 1) loads an HTML page that lists the test cases for a test suite in a JavaScript controlled HTML list box for the test suite (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0032] and page 3, paragraph [0042]); and

one or more test cases are identified based on a template file, such as an HTML

file that lists the applets for a particular test suite (see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0085]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Manda with Dutta in order to efficiently select one or more test cases based on a template file lists the test cases for a particular test suite.

Regarding claims 11 and 12, they are rejected for similar reason as presented above in claims 1 and 4.

Regarding claim 13, Dutta teaches as follows:

a test result reporting step of editing the test cases (designer can edit the web pages and test again based on the appearance in the displays and the browser scorecard, see, e.g., col.8, lines 51-64 and steps 65-68), which constitute the session and have the result values, and reporting the result values of the browser testing (displaying the output of the web page and scorecard file, see, e.g., step 66 in figure 7 and col. 8, lines 32-50 and scorecard result in figure 9-11).

Manda teaches that trace files store the results of executing the test cases (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033]).

Therefore, it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 10.

Regarding claim 14, Dutta teaches as follows:

web designer get access to the web pages to be tested with multitude of browsers (see, e.g., steps 60 and 61 in figure 7 and col. 8, lines 25-32);

selecting a browser and its version to which the test cases will be applied in categories, after gaining access to the test case developing platform (selecting the desired web browsers based on the scorecard rules for evaluating the web site, see,

e.g., steps 62 and 63 in figure 7 and col. 8, lines 32-41); and

creating one or more contents files for use in testing the browser as to whether

the test cases are normally provided through the selected browser and its version, and

registering the created contents files in the database by category (uploading the web

page file, see, e.g., step 61 in figure 7 and col. 8, lines 25-32).

Dutta does not teach of developing a test case.

Manda teaches as follows:

specifying particular test cases be executed for testing multiple browser types

and versions (see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0068]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Manda with Dutta in order to efficiently select one or more test

cases based on specific browser types or versions.

Regarding claim 15, Dutta teaches as follows:

the session creating step comprises the steps of:

gaining access to a browser-testing platform by the tester (web designer get

access to the web pages to be tested with multitude of browsers, see, e.g., steps 60

and 61 in figure 7 and col. 8, lines 25-32);

selecting a browser and its version to be tested in categories, after gaining

access to the browser-testing platform (selecting the desired web browsers based on

the scorecard rules for evaluating the web site, see, e.g., steps 62 and 63 in figure 7

and col. 8, lines 32-41);

registering the created session in the category of the selected version of the

browser and designating a predetermined URL address to the session (see, e.g., step

60 in figure 7 and col. 8, lines 25-32).

Dutta does not teach of selecting one or more test cases to be tested among the

test cases registered in the selected browser and its version and creating a session with

the selected test cases.

Manda teaches as follows:

a plurality of test cases (test case applet A,B and C) registered on the browser

test server (trigger identifies the proper template file from the set of template files that

are specified in the configuration file, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0040], wherein each

template file may be JavaScript-controlled HTML list box, such as applets A, B, C, for

test suite, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0042]);

a mechanism for testing execution of applets with plug-ins and applications

includes test cases and each test case is executed by a Java Plug-in that executes with

a web browser (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]);

scheduler (130 in figure 1) loads an HTML page that lists the test cases for a test

suite in a JavaScript controlled HTML list box for the test suite (see, e.g., page 2,

paragraph [0032] and page 3, paragraph [0042]); and

one or more test cases are identified based on a template file, such as an HTML

file that lists the applets for a particular test suite (see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0085]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine Manda with Dutta in order to efficiently select one or more test

cases based on a template file lists the test cases for a particular test suite.

Regarding claim 16, Dutta teaches as follows:

the browser testing step comprises the steps of:

gaining access to a web page of the session with a predetermined URL address

through the browser to be tested (web designer get access to the web pages to be

tested with multitude of browsers, see, e.g., steps 60 and 61 in figure 7 and col. 8, lines

25-32);

receiving the test cases (web page files) constituting the session (see, e.g., steps

60 and 61 in figure and col. 8, lines 25-32); and

receiving the result values from the tester and registering the received result

values in the session, the result values indicating whether the contents of the provided

test cases are normally provided through the browser (see, e.g., steps 62-66 in figure 7

and col. 8, lines 32-50 and figure 9-11 from col. 9, line 55 to col. 10, line 44).

Regarding claim 19, Dutta does not teach a plurality of test cases.

Manda teaches as follows:

a plurality of test cases (test case applet A,B and C) registered on the browser

test server (trigger identifies the proper template file from the set of template files that

are specified in the configuration file, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0040], wherein each

template file may be JavaScript-controlled HTML list box, such as applets A, B, C, for

test suite, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0042]);

a mechanism for testing execution of applets with plug-ins and applications

includes test cases and each test case is executed by a Java Plug-in that executes with

a web browser (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0029]);

scheduler (130 in figure 1) loads an HTML page that lists the test cases for a test suite in a JavaScript controlled HTML list box for the test suite (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0032] and page 3, paragraph [0042]); and

one or more test cases are identified based on a template file, such as an HTML file that lists the applets for a particular test suite (see, e.g., page 7, paragraph [0085]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Manda with Dutta in order to efficiently select one or more test cases based on a template file lists the test cases for a particular test suite.

Regarding claims 21 and 23-27, Dutta teaches that scorecard gives the user a summary of how the web site would be displayed on the various browsers (see, e.g., col. 7, lines 50-59 and step 62 in figure 7).

Regarding claim 22, Dutta teaches as follows:

the session is the web page created from a plurality of test cases, and the predetermined test case is a single contents file used to form the web page (URL pointing to a file that contains the location of the web site that the designer wants to evaluate, see, e.g., col. 8, lines 25-30 and step 60 in figure 7).

Regarding claims 28 and 29, Manda teaches as follows:

a stored session classified by a category is selected to be tested according to a corresponding category of a selected version of the browser such that the predetermined test cases included therein are tested is assigned for each different client version of a particular web browser (specifying particular test cases be executed for testing multiple browser types and versions, see, e.g., page 5, paragraph [0068]).

Therefore, they are rejected for similar reason as presented above in

Regarding claim 30, Dutta teaches as follows:

the predetermined test cases are tested during the browser testing and each of

the one or more values (score criteria) directly corresponds to a predetermined test

case within the session (the browser scorecard shows each browser is give a score for

specific criteria and a total cumulative score, see, e.g., col. 11, lines 35-44 and figure

11).

Dutta does not teach of reporting the result of the test cases.

Manda teaches as follows:

reporting the result of the browser testing includes representing the values for the

test cases as at least one of tables and graphs and outputting the represented values

as a document (trace files, 142A-C in figure 1, store the results of executing the test

cases, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033]).

Therefore, it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 1.

Conclusion

4.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to JEONG S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-

1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 - 3:30

EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./

Examiner, Art Unit 2454

March 26, 2009

/Dustin Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454